



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CONTEMPT—PETITION FOR RECALL OF JUDGE. The defendant circulated a petition for the recall of a judge and, in a statement of the grounds for the proposed recall, as required by the state constitution, alleged judicial misconduct relative to a pending trial. *Held*, in view of the constitutional provisions as to the recall of officers, the statement in the petition was privileged and the defendant was not guilty of contempt. *Marians v. People ex rel Hines* (Colo. 1917) 169 Pac. 155.

A court possesses the power to commit for contempt, according to the American view, in order, that it may prevent interference with the administration of justice. 5 Columbia Law Rev. 249. A publication of matter reflecting upon the conduct of a pending cause is held to interfere with the course of justice and to be a "constructive" contempt. *State v. Hipple Printing Co.* (1915) 36 S. D. 210, 154 N. W. 292; *People ex rel. Connor v. Stapleton* (1893) 18 Colo. 568, 33 Pac. 167. The courts have been inclined, however, to restrict their common law power to commit for "constructive" contempt. For example, at common law an unfavorable criticism of the conduct of any trial, past or pending, was contempt, but it is now generally held in the United States that the criticism must relate to a pending cause. *Rapalje*, Contempt 56; 5 Columbia Law Rev. 249. In certain instances they have made further restrictions on their power to commit for contempt so as to not interfere with other policies of the law. *Cf. State v. Circuit Ct.* (1897) 97 Wis. 1, 72 N. W. 193. Thus a lawyer is not guilty of contempt in charging the presiding judge with misconduct, in an application for a change of venue, *In re Smith* (1913) 54 Colo. 486, 131 Pac. 277; *cf. Ex parte Curtis* (1859) 3 Minn. 274, and it was once held that an unfavorable criticism of the merits of a pending prosecution was not contempt if made wholly for the purpose of preventing the re-election of the governor who had instituted the prosecution. *People v. Few* (N. Y. 1807) 2 Johns. *290. Many conflicting decisions have arisen as to the power of a legislature to deprive the courts of their power to commit for "constructive" contempt, 4 Columbia Law Rev. 65, but it would seem to be unquestioned that a state constitution can deprive them of that power. *Cf. Ex parte Hickey* (1844) 12 Miss. 751. Since neither truth, *Globe Newspaper Co. v. Commonwealth* (1905) 188 Mass. 449, 74 N. E. 682; *Hughes v. Territory* (1906) 10 Ariz. 119, 85 Pac. 1058, nor the absence of willful intent, *In re Independent Pub. Co.* (D. C. 1915) 228 Fed. 787; *People v. Freer* (N. Y. 1804) 1 Caines 518, would ordinarily be a defense to contempt proceedings, it would seem that the provisions of the Colorado constitution requiring that the petitioner for the recall of a judge state the grounds of the proposed recall, could not be made effective unless the petitioner be protected against punishment for "constructive" contempt.

CONTRACTS — APPARENT MISTAKE IN OFFER BY TELEGRAPH. — The defendant delivered to a telegraph company an offer to sell a carload of potatoes at \$1.35 per bushel. Through a mistake in transmission the order as delivered to the plaintiff read 35 cents per bushel. The plaintiff accepted at once by telegraph. The potatoes were shipped by a bill of lading to the shipper's order with a draft attached for the price at \$1.35 per bushel. On presentation the plaintiff refused to pay the draft and later tendered the amount at 35 cents per bushel. Delivery of the goods being refused, he sued the carrier and the offeror in replevin. *Held*, since the telegraph company was the agent of the offeror title passed on the tender of the contract price, and